

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/031,871	KAWAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tarifur R Chowdhury	2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tarifur R Chowdhury. (3) ____.
- (2) Ms. Ellen Smith. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: USPAT 6,160,595.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative presented the differences between the applied prior art and the instant invention. The examiner notified applicant's representative that the claim does not appear to be patentably distinct and the rejection is still valid. The examiner further pointed out to applicant's representative that the claim lack structural relationship between the optical rotator, cholesteric liquid crystal and the quarter wave plate. Further, it was also pointed to applicant's representative that the argument such as the axes of the quarter wave plate being rotated by an angle of 45 degrees by means of optical rotator plays were irrelevant since the limitation is not in the claim and insertion of such limitation will be helpful to further define the claimed invention. Finally applicant's representative was also notified that any amendment to the claims would require further consideration to define patentability. .

